



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

outside of the episcopal libraries, copies were generally to be found in Benedictine cloisters, almost never in the foundation of the Cistercian and other orders, is an indication of the status of the author, useless as a criterion in the case of Adam de Perseigne, who was a Benedictine before becoming a Cistercian. Longinus is not mentioned in *John*, xix, 34 (101), and since the editor has credited his author with an acquaintance with the *Evangelium Nicodemi* (xxii-xxiii, 98), why has he not found the source of the two verses (1249-1250):

Quant il atocha au costé
Dont Longis ot le fer osté

in the verses of the apocryphal work, "Accipiens autem Longinus miles lanceam aperuit latus eius,"²³ although the name "Longis" and the legend in regard to it were very common in medieval French literature.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

Cornell University.

JOSEPH WIEHR, *Hebbel und Ibsen in ihren Anschauungen verglichen*. Thesis Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Pennsylvania. Stuttgart, 1908. 183 pp., 8°.

This thesis seeks to compare the ethical, sociological, and psychological views of Ibsen and Hebbel as the author gathers them from the dramas of both poets and from the diaries and letters of Hebbel. The rich Ibsen "Nachlasz"

Cantori et Custodi almariorum cuicumque prohibemus districtius sub inobedientiae poena ne saltem sine licentia Prioris ultra unum diem alicui accommodentur aut tradantur." This passage only appears in this edition of a chronicle, of which the authenticity is more than dubious. It is not found in the only extant manuscript, which was the source of Savile's and Birch's editions (see *Rer. Angl. Scriptores post Bedam*, MDXCVI, fol. 519 vers.), as has been pointed out to me by my friend Professor E. K. Rand. The passage has not been traced to its source, nor has an analogous monastic practise been noted (J. W. Clark, *Care of Books*, 64-75), but it has an independent value as denoting the contemporary practise of the fifteenth century, when the forgery was written.

²³ Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*, 2d. ed., p. 362.

which has modified our views of the poet considerably had not at the time appeared. Under the headings of Weltanschauung; Stellung zur Religion; Sittlichkeit; Staat, Gesellschaft, Individuum; Die Frau und die Ehe, he seeks to formulate the affinities and divergences of these two great thinkers and writers of the nineteenth century. Verbosity and a strong and annoying tendency to irrelevance frequently cloud the issue. The conclusion, as stated in general terms is: "In den Anschauungen Hebbels und Ibsens finden wir eine weitgehende Uebereinstimmung, doch wo dieselbe fehlt, treffen wir in der Regel auf einen absoluten Gegensatz" (p. 174). W. shows that basically the view of life of the two dramatists is identical: a conception of a dualistic world, in which a continual struggle is being waged between the "All" and the individual (pp. 25 ff.). Both looked upon the present state of society pessimistically, but hoped for a betterment of conditions in the future. They differed radically, however, in the method of procedure. This in Ibsen's case was a revolutionary attack on social conditions, which he depicted as unmitigatedly wrong and in need of immediate change. Hebbel, on the other hand, from the vantage ground of his "zauberkräftige Formel" (p. 8), saw the cause and justification of both the convention and the attack. Confusing in this connection is W.'s statement (p. 20) "dasz er (Hebbel) soziale Umstände nicht als berechnigte Gegenmacht ansieht," a cryptic remark not substantiated by any examples. Moreover, W. goes too far when he says: "Ibsen war selbst zu sehr Partei und stellte sich, wenigstens in seinen sozialen Dramen, mit Entschiedenheit auf die Seite der Gegner des Bestehenden" (p. 65). Ibsen criticises not only the social conventions which are the object of attack but also the critics who attack them. And if we may well say with W. that Hebbel "es zuwege brachte, allen Parteien recht zu geben" (p. 65), we may say of Ibsen that he shows all sides to be in the wrong. W.'s failure to perceive this leads him into unnecessary and wearisome disquisitions on the fallacies of Nora, Helene Alving, etc., whom he seems to regard as Ibsen's ideals of what human beings should be. A study of Anzengruber's *Pfarrer von Kirchfeld* might have shown W. the differ-

ence between an author who really champions one side of a problem and a critic of the whole of life like Ibsen. W. might then not have stigmatized the source of *Puppenheim*, as given by Brandes, as a "kümmerliche Alltagsgeschichte" (p. 159). For the artist who chose the attic-studio of Helmer Ekdal for loving description, such a term hardly exists.

W. shows that, as time went on, Ibsen became more revolutionary in his attacks on society, Hebbel growing less aggressive. For this amelioration of feeling on the part of Hebbel, W. kindly supplies the personal motive that as society began to smile upon the poet, he became its advocate (pp. 90 f.). In discussing the two poets' attitude on the question of the freedom of the will, W. makes a good distinction. Hebbel he shows to be a determinist (though with occasional contradictions), his characters all obeying an "absolute necessity," while Ibsen's people are "unfrei," being under the pressure of conventions, circumstances, the will of others (pp. 48 ff.). As to their position towards women, W. concludes that Hebbel never and Ibsen only at one period of his life favored the "emancipation" of woman, but that both agreed in demanding for her recognition as an individual (p. 146 f.). This statement is only partially satisfactory. As Woerner has shown, Ibsen was the culmination and Hebbel, with Kleist, the transition of a movement which began with the Romanticists and which revolutionized the conventional attitude towards the "sex-war," the evolution of the "grande amoureuse" of the past into the modern comrade of man (Woerner, II, p. 257). Moreover, it is necessary here to distinguish between the theoretical words of a writer and his literary creations. Kleist presented in his *Nathalie* a person far superior to his conception of women as we see it in his letters. Here, eighteenth century thinking and nineteenth century feeling were at war. The same is sometimes true of Hebbel. He claims far more for *Mariamne* and *Rhodope* as regards independence of action and demands for recognition, than many of his utterances in the diaries and letters would suggest.

Of a number of errors and hasty conclusions, a few of the more disturbing are: the confusion of *Gyges* and *Kandaules* in the discussion of Hebbel's *Gyges und sein Ring* (p. 65 and again p. 88).

To claim that Ibsen invented the "returning traveller or newly arrived stranger for the purpose of exposition" (p. 17) sounds a bit innocent. We need but think of *Hamlet* where Horatio's return serves this purpose. To say that Ibsen's drama has had but slight influence on the literary productivity of England (p. 16) is to wipe out of existence almost all of the modern English drama: Bernard Shaw as well as Jones and Pinero. The firstnamed freely acknowledged his indebtedness; in fact, whole plays like *Man and Superman* are Ibsen anglicized, while the others may be called Ibsen lemonaded.

The points which Wiehr makes are largely obscured and made inaccessible to the reader by the undue space given to disquisitions on general subjects for the purpose of making us acquainted with W.'s own views on questions like Socialism and Democracy followed by an attack on "haltlose Phantasten" like Tolstoi, who expect the salvation of mankind from the masses (pp. 107 f., 129); on the emancipation of women and woman's place in creation (p. 129); on marriage (pp. 159 f.); on the advantages of city life (p. 165), etc., etc. All this garrulity, however valuable, is less interesting to the reader than the views of Hebbel and Ibsen on these subjects. Regrettable also is the flip-pantly journalistic tone together with a note of personal virulence which mars what should be a calmly scientific exposition (pp. 127, 129, 136, 137, 154, 155, 170, 173, etc.). After pages devoted to a very personal and subjective arraignment of Hebbel in his action towards *Elise Lensing* (pp. 100-102, 133-137), W. amusingly says: "Ich denke nicht daran, über Hebbels Handlungsweise zu Gericht ziehen zu wollen" (p. 135). W. is most liberal in furnishing mean and petty motives not only to Hebbel and Ibsen but to all who may disagree with him (pp. 90, 116 f., 131, 168).

The conclusion which W. reached and which might have been reached in 50 instead of 183 pages, is that Hebbel and Ibsen both attacked society on behalf of the individual, but made that attack from opposite points of departure: Ibsen as revolutionist, Hebbel as evolutionist. The point that should have been more emphasized is that their great service to mankind and to art lies in the fact that both held up for searching criticism

old and revered institutions, and that both laid the center of gravity on the inner life and not on outer conventions. Ibsen, as Woerner has shown, was the volunteer asked for in Hebbel's *Gyges*, who should dare to break "den Schlaf der Welt" and wrest away worthless but cherished playthings.

HENRIETTA BECKER VON KLENZE.
Providence, R. I.

Das Passé Défini und Imparfait im Altfranzösischen, von P. SCHAECHTELIN. Halle: Niemeyer, 1911. 83 pp. Beiheft 30 zur ZRPh.

The author of the work under discussion states that he has attempted to determine the exact syntactical meaning of the imperfect and past definite in Old and Modern French, hoping to discover and help to measure any variation of usage between the two periods in respect to these tenses. Dissatisfied with preceding works upon the subject, he has chosen the thirteenth century as a field of study, and from its literature has selected the three historians Villehardouin, Joinville, and Henri de Valenciennes. All of these he has used in the edition of N. de Wailly, whose translations into Modern French have served him as a basis of comparison between the usage in the two periods. As a result of this investigation Schaechtelin has come to conclusions which may here be presented in a slightly different order to meet the demands of condensed exposition.

The past definite is essentially a narrative tense, and as such the idea of succession (Reihenbegriff) is inseparable from it. Therefore, unless used with other past definites, the verbal form (which for convenience of distinction will be termed the preterite in English) is not a past definite, but rather an "isolated perfect" which is not narrative, but on the contrary explanatory, like the imperfect, from which, however, it differs in not being contemporaneous. Even when a preterite occurs with other preterite forms, we have an isolated perfect and not a past definite to deal with unless the narrative advances. Moreover, just as the past definite is at times found in an inchoative sense, besides its ordinary meaning, so the isolated perfect shows both usages, as seen

in the following passage taken from Nisard's *Caesar*, vi, 30 :

La fortune peut beaucoup en toute chose, et surtout à la guerre. Car si ce fut un grand hasard de surprendre Ambiorix . . . ce fut (isolated perfect inchoative) aussi pour lui un grand bonheur qu' . . . il pût échapper à la mort.

It will be seen that the isolated perfect is subjective, explanatory ; it is especially common in the case of the auxiliaries, and from it arose the extended use of the past indefinite, which was also originally explanatory.

The second point that Schaechtelin investigates is the nature of inchoative value ; his results are derived especially from a study of the auxiliaries. The argument is based upon the Indo-European etymology of Latin *fui*, which means originally "to grow." This root does not occur in all of the tenses, hence the inchoative value did not spread to the other, non-perfect forms of the verb ; indeed, so powerful was the auxiliary *fut*. in French that it kept *avoir* from having an inchoative meaning throughout, although the latter is etymologically fitted for such a value by its connection with the Greek root "to seize." *Etre* and *avoir*, therefore, kept the inchoative meaning in the perfect ; in Old French, and even at the present day, they are found in the preterite more often than other verbs ; all other cases of inchoative meaning must be traced to analogy with *fut*, sometimes aided by etymological elements lying dormant in the verb itself (p. 51). Not all verbs are capable of receiving this double meaning, nor does it exist throughout the verb ; thus *statum* (> *été*) is never inchoative, except in the case of *j' ai été* + participle, where the inchoative meaning is derived from its use to replace *je fus* + participle. It is essential to distinguish the inchoative value of *fut* from its purely narrative, past definite use, which, independent of any verbal meaning, gives succession.

The pluperfect and past definite correspond exactly to the simple tenses of the auxiliaries. The extended use of the past anterior as a narrative tense in Old French gave rise, upon its decline, to the development of a new form. *J' eus fait* might be either inchoative or not. How-